

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/461,170	06/05/95	ROSENBERG	L IMM1P007A

PAUL L HICKMAN  
HICKMAN & BEYER  
PO BOX 61059  
PALO ALTO CA 94306

26M2/0215

BRIER EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2609

22

DATE MAILED:

02/15/96

**Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.**

Commissioner of Patents

## Interview Summary

Application No. <b>08/461,170</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Osenburg et al</b>
Examiner <b>Jeffery A. Brier</b>	Group Art Unit <b>2609</b>
	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffery A. Brier

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) F Jim Riegel

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 12, 1996

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5, 12, 35, 39, 48, and 54

Identification of prior art discussed:

Hara, Davies, and Fisher.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The proposed amendment submitted by facsimile on 2/9/96 was considered during the interview. Proposed claim 1 would result in reconsideration of the last rejection. Claim 35 would remain rejected based upon the prior art used in the last office action. Proposed claims 39, 48, and 54 would overcome the last prior art rejection of those claims, however, consideration of the prior art present in the file and additional research will be performed before an indication of allowability is given for claims 39, 48, and 54.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

  
**JEFFERY A. BRIER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 2609**

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.